Hos-4

# OCULAR ESTIMATES OF WESTERN SPRUCE BUDWORM DAMAGE IN EASTERN OREGON--1985

By

Roger Sandquist, Entomologist and Tommy Gregg, Statistician

#### Introduction

Western spruce budworm, <u>Choristoneura occidentalis</u> Freeman (WSBW), continues to defoliate host species in central and eastern Oregon. Some areas in eastern Oregon have incurred their fifth year of defoliation and are now showing some bare-top and tree mortality.

In 1981, when it became apparent that an outbreak of WSBW was beginning, sample plots were established to determine current losses due to WSBW and gather background data for future impact assessment of the outbreak (Harvey 1981). Ten-point variable radius cluster plots were established at four locations: Mill Creek in the Cove Watershed and Marble Creek in the Baker Watershed, both on the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest; Ditch Creek, south of Heppner on the Umatilla National Forest; and Kline Spring, southeast of Prairie City on the Malheur National Forest.

After observing the extent and intensity of defoliation and apparent top-kill in 1985, Forest Pest Management entomologists became concerned that the impacts of WSBW may be underestimated in current analyses of the situation. The objectives of this study were to estimate the amount of defoliation for 1984 and 1985 and the apparent top-kill occurring in the four established plots.

#### Sample Plot Description

Mill creek--This plot is located at T.3 South, R. 41 East, NE 1/4 of section 29. The elevation is 5450 feet. This is a mature stand (116 ft ba/a) thinned in 1973 or 1974. It consists of lodgepole pine (40 ft ba/a), 8-12 inches dbh, and Douglas-fir (30 ft ba/a), 8-12 inches dbh. The stand is fairly open with thinning slash scattered over the area. Very little regeneration is apparent.

Marble Creek--This plot is located at T. 9 South, R. 38 East, SW 1/4 of section 12. The elevation is 5000 feet. This is a mature stand (104 ft ba/a), consisting of grand fir (78 ft ba/a), 8-18 inches dbh and Douglas-fir (14 ft ba/a), 12-20 inches dbh. The understory was established with about equal numbers of grand and Douglas-fir.

Ditch Creek--This plot is located at T. 5 South, R. 28 East, SW 1/4 of section 27. The elevation is 4500 ft. This is a mature stand (110 ft ba/a), predominantly grand fir (71.7 ft ba/a), 10-20 inches dbh, with Douglas-fir (13.3 ft ba/a), 10-20 inches dbh, and ponderosa pine (15 ft ba/a), 18-24 inches dbh. There is a moderately stocked understory of grand fir and pine. This area was treated with carbaryl in 1982.

Kline Spring--This plot is located at T. 13 South, R. 35 East, SW 1/4 of section 15. The elevation is 5900 feet. This is a mature stand (178 ft ba/a) predominantly lodgepole pine (78 ft ba/a), 8-14 inches dbh, with grand fir (58

ft ba/a), and Douglas-fir (26 ft ba/a), both 6-16 inches dbh. The understory is dominated by lodgepole pine. This area was treated with carbaryl in 1982.

THE STATE OF A TOWN AND THE CONTROL OF THE CONTROL

Appendices A-D display the stand tables for basal areas per acre and trees per acre for the four plots.

#### <u>Methods</u>

When establishing the plots in 1981 a 20 BAF wedge prism was used to determine those trees included within the plot. The trees were numbered and data was collected on each of these trees.

In 1985, ocular estimates of defoliation on current and last year's foliage were recorded independently for each third of the normal tree bole that supports live, green foliage. These estimates were made in late July and early August on all numbered host trees that were included in each plot. For each crown category, the defoliation was rated as one of the following classes:

Class 0 no visible defoliation

- 1 1-25% defoliation
- 2 26-50% defoliation
- 3 51-75% defoliation
- 4 76-100% defoliation

Estimates of bare top (apparent top-kill) were determined ocularly as that percentage of the total bole of the tree that was devoid of foliage from the top of the tree. Using the baseline information collected in 1981 and the estimates of bare top in 1985, stand tables were constructed to summarize the data (see Appendices).

#### Results and Discussion

Defoliation estimates indicate moderate to heavy defoliation in 1984 and generally heavy defoliation in 1985 at all locations. These estimates are from overstory trees within the variable radius plots and involve no understory. This information will be kept on file for later analysis with other years' defoliation estimates when the outbreak is over. Crimp (1982) found that binocular estimates of defoliation underestimate actual defoliation by ten percent. If true in this study, the actual defoliation in 1984 and 1985 was generally very heavy.

The damage estimate for grand fir used in the prognosis model (Wykoff et al 1985) is 11 percent of 6-12 inch dbh trees will have an average of 2 percent of their total height top-killed (var 0.4) during the whole outbreak. For 6-12 inch dbh Douglas-fir, 7 percent of the trees will have an average of 2 percent of their total height top-killed (var 0.4) during the whole outbreak. Table 1 shows the extent and intensity of bare top at the four plot locations. Three out of four plots exceeded the damage levels currently used.

Table 1. Western Spruce Budworm-Caused Bare Top of Host Trees in Eastern Oregon Sample Plots.

And the second s

	Gr	and fir	Dougla	s-fir <sup>1/</sup>
Location	% of trees with bare top	mean bare top (% of total bole)	% of trees with bare top	mean bare top (% of total bole)
Mill Creek Marble Creek Ditch Creek <u>2/</u> Kline Spring <u>2</u>		9.7 ±4.9 13.6 ±6.4 1.8 ±7.2 2.2 ±4.2	40.5 45.4 0 27.2	4.0 ±5.0 6.0 ±7.7 

<sup>1/</sup> The occurrence of Douglas-fir in these plots is so low that the data here may not represent what happens to this species when found in greater numbers.

The Ditch Creek and Kline Spring plots are apparently suffering less damage than the other two plots. There are two factors which may account for this difference. Kline Spring is a high-elevation site (5900 ft.) at the edge of subalpine fir habitat and may not support a high budworm population density. Secondly, both Kline Spring and Ditch Creek were treated with the insecticide carbaryl in 1982. The intensity of 1984 and 1985 defoliation seemed less at Ditch Creek than the other three areas from a cursory inspection of the defoliation estimates.

While generalizations cannot be made from these four plots to represent the entire outbreak area in eastern Oregon, the information supports the idea that more damage may be occurring than has been estimated in environmental analyses of the situation. Because of the disparity between the damage estimates used in analyzing the current outbreak and the apparently higher levels of bare top already occurring on these plots, it is desirable to determine if damage estimates must be modified in subsequent analyses. The differences between plots suggest considerable variation in damage due to budworm. The cummulative effect of this defoliation is unknown. It is safe to assume that the general tree condition is declining and will probably continue to decline until after the outbreak subsides. Future site-specific analyses may allow managers to be more discriminating in their damage simulations and in assigning treatment priority to prevent or reduce damage from budworm defoliation.

The percent of trees having noticeable bare top and the mean and standard deviation of the percent of total bole of the tree having bare top, are the parameters that can be used in the prognosis model (Wykoff et al 1985). Also a designation of trees into three height classes is needed to drive the TOP-KILL portion of the model. This latter information is readily available from routine plot installation records.

<sup>2/</sup> Carbaryl was applied to these areas in 1982.

Additional information is needed to adjust the damage in our simulations to reflect the on-the-ground damage.

Detailed damage estimates should be developed which represent specific sites and conditions. Damage estimates for understory are lacking and should be developed. The use of geographic information system technology should be evaluated to store, manipulate and display this and other information to allow rapid and accurate analysis.

<u>Acknowledgement</u>-The assistance of Tim McConnell in collecting the data on the Kline Springs plot is acknowledged and appreciated.

#### References

- Crimp, P. M.
  - 1982. Impacts of Western Budworm on Tree Growth on the Eastern Slope of the Washington Cascades. Unpubl. M. S. Thesis, Univ. Washington, Seattle, WA. 130 p.

المناف المناف المناف المنافع ا

- Harvey, R. D., Jr.
  - 1981. Effects of Western Spruce Budworm Feeding on Douglas-fir and True Firs of Eastern Oregon. Forest Pest Management special evaluation. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Portland, OR.
- Wykoff, W. R.
  - ---. Supplement to the users guide of stand prognosis model--version 5.0 (Draft). INT.-\_\_\_\_, Ogden, Ut: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station.

Appendix A Mill Creek

NO JON II	IFACT PLU	TS19	RI-1985		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	er o de la decima de la companya de		P
HILL-PLN1				•• ••				•
and the second section of the s			• • • •			* /* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	remain as many case y	e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e
		THE STAND	TAPLE OF B	ASAL AREAS	PER ACRE	***		
******	******						er e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	The proposition of the second
DIAMETER		GRAND	WESTERN	ENGLEMAN	PINC DOCA	**************************************	*******	•
CLASS	EIG	FIR	LARCH	SPRUCE	PINE	"LONGPOLE PINE	CLASSES	r •• or one or
						r ING	CLASSES	ere removament para la propria de la propria
	-n-							_
6	• 0	2. n		.0	•0	•0.	.0-	
·· <del>g</del>		2.0	•0	• 0	• 0	• 0	2.0	
10	10.0	22.0	•0		• 0	14.0	20.0	
17	12.0		4.0	• 0	• 0	16.0	52.0	
14	2.0	5. n	5.0	• 0	• n	10.0	34.0	* ***********************
16		=	2.0	• 0	• 0	• 0	6.0	
18	• 9	• 17	· Ū	• 0	•n ··-		~ ~~2.0	
e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	• 17 	• 0	•0	• 0	• 0	• 0	• 0	
TOTAL	39.0	38.0	8.n	• 0	. 0	40.0	114	
PERCENT	25.9	37.8	6.9	• 0	• 0	34.5	116.0	
DBH[OMD]	1t.4 -	10.6	11.6 ***		.0	_	100.0	
NU.SAMPLES	10	10	10	10	10	9.9	10.6	
CA%	" 105.4 "	130.1	174.8	··· • ·· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		10	10	
SETMEAN	10.000	16.720	4.427	• กบก		100.0	33.3	• • • • • • • •
SE%	33.3	44.0	55.3	.000	• n • no ù	12.649 31.6	12.220 10.5	

STAND TABLE MUST C

R6-SBW IMPACT PLUTS

1981-1989

HILL PLOT

## \*\*\* STAND TABLE OF TREES PER ACRE \*\*\*

	CLASSES	PINE	PTNE	ENGLEMAN SPRUCE	-WESTERN LARCH	GRAND FIR	FIR	DIAMETER CLASS
·	•0	•0		.0	•••			
	10.2	•0	• 0	.0	•0	10.2 	•0 <del></del>	6
	<del>5</del> 7;3 95•4	40 <del>.</del> 1 — 29.3	•0	•0	7.4	40.4	18.3	10
-	<del>13.2</del> 5.7	<del></del>	•0	•0	<del>2.5</del> 1.9	12.7 1.9	15.3 1.9	14
	1.4	•0	•0	•0	•0	•0	1.4	16 18
	213-2	82-1	. 0		11.8	70.9 33.3	47.4	TOTAL PERCENT
<del></del>	100.0	38.5 9.4	-0	•0	5.5 11.2	<del></del>	10.7	DBH(OND)
	10	10 113.9	10	10	10 172.1	10 145.4	10 <del>107.0</del>	NO.SAMPLES
	<del>37+2</del>	29.587	•000	•000	6.394	32.587	16.374	SETHEAN
		36-0	0		54.4	46.0	33.8	SE%

•

				DAT	F:-10/15/8	1 <del>5 P</del> 1	AGE 3		
STAND TABL	F-NO. 2							1 ' .	
R6=SBW 1M	PACT PLO	TC 10	81=1985						
<del>- #1LL-PL01</del>			CENT-BARE-	TOP GRAND	-FIR-+++				•
		A44 CTAND						<i>'</i> :	
		*** STAND	TABLE OF T	REES PER AL	CRE ***				
DIANETER	GREEN	ONE		######################################		******			
CLASS	TOP	PERCENT	PERCENT	THREE PERCENT	FOUR+ PERCENT	THERS-	TOTAL ALL CLASSES	·	
*****	PROPERTY.	**********			1 WWW WW WW WW WW		Memorana Apartica		
4	•0	•0	•0	-0	.0		•0-		
<del></del>	• 0 <del>5 • 7 -</del>	10.2	-0	.0	.0	.0	10.2		
10	3.7	29.3	7.3	•0	•0	<del>51.6</del> 55.1	<del>5</del> 7 <del>-3</del>		
12	-0-	12.7	•0		<del>•</del> •	30.6	95.4 +3-3-		
14	•0	1.9	•0	• 0	• 0	3.7	5.6	•	
18	• 0	•0	•0	.0		1.4	1.4		
			• 17	• U	•0	.0	•0		
TOTAL	9.4	54.1	7:3						
PERCENT	4.4	25.4	3.4	•0	•0	142.4- 66.8	<del>213.2</del> 100.0		
DBM(QMD) ND.SAMPLES	10	10.1	10.0		.0	10.0-	10.0		
CY%	10 -217.1	10 167-5	10 210.8	10	10	10	10		
SE (MEAN)	6.450	28.680	4.889	•000	.000	63.2- 28.435	<del>37,2</del>		
SE%	68.6		66.7			20.0-	25.071		
******	*******	*******	******	*****	*****				,,,,





STAND TABLE NO. 2

K6-SBW IMPACT PLUTS 1981-1985

HILL PLOT \*\*\* PERCENT BARE TOP DOUGLAS-FIR \*\*\*

	TNTAL ALL CLASSES	OTHERS	FOUR+	THREE PERCENT	TWO PERCENT	ONE PERCENT	GREEN TOP	DIAMETER CLASS
,		_				_	_	
	10.2	10.2	•0	•0	•0	•0 •0	•0	6
	57.2 95.5	<del>45:8</del> 77:1	•0	•0	•0	<del></del>	<del>7.7</del> 11.0	<del>8</del> 10
	43.3	28.0		<del></del>	•0	5.1	10.2	12
	5.6 1.4	3.7	•0	•0	•0	1.4	1.9	14
	• 0	•0	<u>. n</u>	•0	•0	• 0	• 0	18
		164.8				19.6	29.B	TOTAL
	100.0	77.3	•0	.0	.0	9.2	13.5	PERCENT
	10:0	10	10	10	10	10.5	10.7	DBH(QND) NO.SAMPLES
	<del>37.2</del> 25.071	58.7 30.607	•000	•000		126.2 7.821	137.1 12.481	CV% SE(MEAN)
	11.6	18.6				39.9	43.4	SE%

Appendix B Marble Creek

--DATF:-10/15/85----PAGE--2 STAND TABLE NO. 1 R6=58W-IMPACT-PLOTS-1981-1985 1 . . BAKER-PLOT \*\*\* STAND TABLE OF BASAL AREAS PER ACRE \*\*\* DIAMFIER DOUGLAS GRAND-FIR CLASS FIR LARCH SPRUCE PINE PINE CLASSES •0 •0 •0 •0 -0 •0 . 0 4.0 .0 . 0 .0 • 0 4.0 .0 16.0 -0--0-<del>-</del>0-- O-16.0 10 . 0 10.0 2.0 . 0 .0 .0 12.0 12 2.0 22.0 2-0--.0--0 2.0-28-0-14 4.0 8.0 .0 2.0 • 0 .0 14.0 16 2.0 0.0 2.0 -0-.0 -0 10-0-18 .0 8.0 .0 • 0 • 0 • 0 8.0 20 2.0 4-0 -0-•0 -0-•0 6=0-22 • 0 • 0 • 0 • 0 • 0 . 0 • 0 24 .0-•0 -0-<del>-</del>n-•0--5 O---0-26 4.0 • 0 • 0 • 0 . 0 .0 4.0 28 -17 .0 2.0 -0 -0 .0 2-0-30 • 0 • 0 •0 .0 .0 • 0 • 0 TOTAL 14.0 78.0 8.0 -2:0--0--2::0-104-0-PERCENT 13.5 75.0 7.7 1.9 • 0 1.9 100.0 DBHCONDI 19.1 12.7 17.9 14-0 .0 -1.5-0-14.2 NU.SAMPLES 19 10 10 10 10 10. 10 CY%-117.5 72.0 174-8-316-2--0-316.2 68-3-SE (MEAN) 5.207 17.751 4.422 2.000 .000 2.000 22.470 22.8 **プロスー** 37.2 55.3 100-0--0-100:0--21-6-

STAND TABLE NU. 2

R6-SBW IMPACT PLUTS

1971-1985

BAKER PLOT

DIAMETER	<b>DUUGLAS</b>	GRAND	WESTERN	ENGLEMAN	-PUNERUSA-	LODGPOLE	TOTAL ALL	
CLASS	FIR	FIR	LARCH	SPRUCE	PINE	PINE	CLASSES	
<b>5</b>	• 0	•0	•0	• 0	.0	•0	•0	\
6	• 0	20.4	• 0	• 0	• 0	• 0	20.4	
8	• 0	45.9	•0	.0	•0	•0	45.9	
10	• 0	18.3	3.7	• 0	• 0	• 0	22.0	
12	2.5	28.0	2.5	• 0	• 0	2.5	35.5	
14	3.8	7.5	•0	1.9	• 0	•0	13.2	
16	1.4	4.3	1.4	•0	• 0	•0	7.1	
18	• 0	4.5	•0	• 0	• 0	• 0	4.5	
20	• 9	1.8	•0	•0	.0	•0	2.7	
22	• 0	• 0	• 0	• 0	• 0	• 0	•0	8
24	•0	• 0	•0	.0	.,,	•0	.0	
26	1.1	• 0	•0	• 0	• 0	• 0	1.1	•
28	• 0	• 0	•5	•0	• 0	•0	• 5	
30	.0	.0	•0	.0	• 0	•0	•0	
TUTAL								•
PERCENT	9.7 6.3	130.7 85.5	8.1 5.3	1.9	•0	2.5 1.6	152.9 100.0	
OBH (OMD)	15.3	10.5	13.5	14.0	•0	12.0	11.2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
NO.SAMPLES	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	\
CV%	160.1	89.9	169.2	316.2	•0	316.2	84.1	
SE (MEAN)	4.923	37.156	4.341	1.871	.000	2.546	40.669	•
2E%	57.6	28.4	57.5	100.0		100.0	25.6	

STAND TABLE NO. 2

R6-SBW THPACT PLUTS 1981-1985

BAKER PLOT \*\*\* PERCENT BARE TOP GRAND FIR \*\*\*

	TOTAL ALL	OTHERS	FOUR+	THREE	TWO	DONE	GREEN	DIAMETER
1	CLASSES		PERCENT	PERCENT	PERCENT	PERCENT	TUP	CLASS
	· _							
	20.4	•0	•0	•0	10.2	10.2	•0	6
	45.8			<del>.</del> ŏ	17.2	28.6	•0	8
•	22.1	3.7	• 0	3.7	3.7	11.0	• 0	10 '
	35.5	7.6	.0	.0	12.7	7.6	7.6	12
•	13.0	5.6	• 0	• 0	3.7	3.7	• 0	14
	7.2	2.9	.0-	•0	1.4	2.9	•0	16
	4.6	•0	• 0	• 0	2.3	2.3	• 0	18
	2.7	•0	•0	.0	•0	1.8	•0	20 22
	• 0			•0		•0		<del>24</del>
	1.1	1.1	•0	•0	•0	•0	•0	26
						.0	•0	28
	• 0	•0	.0	•0	•0	.0	• 0	30
	15.2			3.7	51.2	68.1	7.6	TOTAL
	152.9 100.0	22.3 14.6	•0	/ 2.4	33.5	44.5	5.0	PERCENT
	11.2	14.7	<del></del> 0-	10.0	10.4	10.4	12.0	DBH(QND)
•	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	NO.SAMPLES
	84.1	101.9	-0	316.2	yR.9	106.8	161.0	CV%
	40.669	7.169	.000	3.667	16.009	23.029	3.890	SE (MEAN)
-	26.6	32.2		100.0	31.3	33.8	50.9	SEX

STAND TABLE NU. 2

R6-SBW IMPACT PLUTS 1981-1985

BAKER PLOT \*\*\* PERCENT BARE TOP DOUGLAS-FIR \*\*\*

DIANETER CLASS	GREEN TOP	PERCENT	TWO PERCENT	THREE PERCENT	FOUR+ PERCENT	OTHERS	TOTAL ALL CLASSES	
4	• 0	.0	•0	•0	•0			
6	• O	• 0	• O	•0	•0	20.4	20.4	
8	•0	•0	•0		<u>.</u>	45.8		
10	• 0	. 0	•0	• 0	•0	22.0	45.8	
12	2.5	•0	-0-	-0	<del>-</del> -	33.1	22.0 35.6	
14	1.9	1.9	•0	•0	• 0	9.4	13.2	
16	•0	• 17	1.4		• 0	5.7	7.1	
18	• 0	• 0	•0	.0	• 0	4.5	4.5	
20		•0	•0-	•0-		1.6	2.7-	
27	~ • Û	• 0	• 0	. • 0	• 0	•0	•0	•
24	• 0	.0	•0	•0	.0	•0	<u>-</u> -	
26	• 0	1.1	• 0	• 0	• 0	•0	1.1	
28	•0	•0	• 0	•0	•0		•5	
30	•0	•0	•0	• 0	• 0	•0	·ó	
TUTAL	5.3	3.11	1.4		.0	143.2	152.9	
PERCENT	3.5	2.0	. 9	• 0	.0	93.7	100.0	
JEH (OMN)	14.4	19.3	16.0	.0	.0	10.7	11.2	
10.SAMPLES	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	•
. V %	175.5	202.2	316.2	.0-	.0	89.9	84.1	
E (MEAN)	2.978	1.890	1.432	•000	.000	40.719	40.669	•
EX	55. R	63.9	100.0	.0-		28.4	26-6	

Appendix C Ditch Creek

	H <del>PACT PLO</del> '				•				
-DITCH PLO								•	
	1	*** STAND 1	TABLE OF B	ASAL AREAS	PER ACRE *	**		***************************************	Minimal Control of Con
******			********	********				,	
DIANETER— CLASS	DOUGLAS FIR	GRAND F1R	WESTERN- LARCH	SPRUCE	PONEROSA— PINE	- LODGPOLE- PINE	TOTAL-ALL CLASSES		
6	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• 0 5• 0	*0 1.7	•0	•0		8.4		
10	1.7	10.0	-0	•0	•0	3.2- 1.7	3.2- 13.4		
12 14	<del>3.2-</del> 1.7	15.0 13.3	.0	•0	• 0	•0	18.2 15.0		
16 18 —20	1.7 3.3	15.0 5.0 	.0	• 0 • 0	3.4 	.0	15.0 10.1 11.6		
22 	•0	1.7	.0	.0	3.3	• 0 1•7	5.0 		
26 	1.7	.0	.0	.0	•0	•0	1.7		
30 32	•0	.0	.0	.0	1.7	• 0	1.7		
TOTAL	13.3	71.7	1.7	.0	15.0	8.3	110.0		Воличной поличений поличений в применений поличений поли
PERCENT DBH(QMD) ND <del>-S</del> AM <del>PLE</del>	12.1 17.3	65.? 14.6 ——12	1.5 6.0 ——12	.0	13.6 22.3 12	7.5 13.1	100.0 16.0		
CVZ S <del>e(mean)</del>	184.6 7.107	78.4 <del>- 16.</del> 229	346.4 1.667	• 0 • 00 0	128.7 5.57 <del>3</del>	190.3 	61.8 19.618		11/1/
\$E%	53 <b>.</b> 3	22.6	100.0	•0	37.2	54.9	17.8		
•									

STAND TABLE NO. 2

R6-SBW IMPACT PLUTS 1981-1985

DITCH PLOT

DIAMETER CLASS	DOUGLAS FIR	GRAND FIR	WESTERN LARCH	ENGLEMAN SPRUCE	PONERUSA PINE	PINE	CLASSES	
				•0	.0	.0	-0	
	•0	25.6	8.5	•0	•0	8.5	42.6	
6	• 0		<del></del> -0	ŏ		9.5	9.5	
8	3.1	18.3	•0	• 0	•0	3.1	24.5	
10		19.1	<del></del> -			.0	23.3	
12	1.6	12.5	•0	•0	•0	•0	14.1	
		10.7			.0	.0	10.7	
16 18	• 0	2.8	, , ,	• 0	1.9	• 0	5.6	
<del>20</del>	1.5	<del></del>			1.5		5.3	
22	0	.6	.0	. 0	1.3	•0	1.9	
	_	<del></del> 5-	<u>.</u> ő		1.1		2.1	
	• 5	•0	•0	• 0	•0	•0	• 5	
26						.0	.0	
28	•0	• 0	•0	. ŏ	• 3	•0	• 3	
30	.0	•0		——•ŏ-				
32	• 0	•0	•0					
*********					6.1	21.6	140.4	
TOTAL	11.8	92.4	8.5	• 0			100.0	
PERCENT	8.4	65.8	6.1	• 0	4.3	15.4		
DBH(OND)	14.4	11.9	6.0	• 0	21.2	8.4	12.0	
NU.SAMPLES	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	
CVZ	195.9	81.6	346.4	.0	134.6	235.8	57.8	
SE (HEAN)	6.663	21.756	8.488	-000	2.361	14.717	23.419	
SE%	56.6	23.5	100.0	• 0	38.9	68.1	16.7	

STAND TABLE NO. 2

K6-SBW IMPACT PLUTS 1981-1985

DITCH PLOT \*\*\* PERCENT BARE TOP GRAND FIR \*\*\*

DIAMETER CLASS	GREEN	PERCENT	TWO PERCENT	THREE PERCENT		OTHERS	TOTAL ALL CLASSES	
	• 0	•0	•0	.0	.0	•0	.0	
6	25.4	• 0	.0	• 0	• 0	17.0	42.4	
0	• 0	• 0	.0	.0	.0	9.5	9.5	
10	15.3	• 0	•0	3.1	• 0	6.1	24.5	
12	19.1	• 0	•0	.0	•0-	4.2	23.3	
14	10.9	1.6	• 0	• 0	• 0	1.6	14.1	
16	8.4	1.2	•0	• 0	1.2	.0	10.8	
18	2.8	• 0	•0	• 0	• 0	2.8	5.6	
20	2.3	• 0	•0	• 0	0	3.1	5.4	
22	_ • 6	• 0	•0	• 0	• 0	1.3	1.9	
24	• 5	• 0	•0	.0	• 0	1.6	2.1	
26	• 0	• 0	•0	• 0	• 0	• 5	· • 5	
28	•0	• 0	• 0	• 0	• 0	.0	•0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
30	•0	•0	•0	• 0	• 0	• 3	• 3	
32	•0	•0	• 0	• 0	•0	•0	•0	
TOTAL	85.3	2.8	.0	3.1	1.2	48.0	140.4	MP-10-Million autoria de discorra serra descria
PERCENT	60.8	2.0	•0	2.2	•9-	34.2	100.0	
DBH(OMD)	11.8	14.9	•0	10.0	16.0	12.1	12.0	
NU. SAMPLES	12	12	12	15	12	12	12	<del></del>
CAX.	83.5	236.0	• 0	346.4	346.4	153.6	57.8	
SETHEANT	20.583	1.875	-000	3:056	1.194	21.269	23.419	
SE%	24.1	68.1	.0	100.0	100.0	44.3	16.7	

STAND TABLE NO. 2

R6-SBW THPACT PLUTS 1981-1985

DITCH PLOT \*\*\* PERCENT BARE TOP DOUGLAS-FIR \*\*\*

DIAMETER	GREEN	ONE	TWO	THREE PERCENT	FOUR+ PERCENT	OTHERS	TOTAL ALL CLASSES	
CLASS	TUP	PERCENT	PERCENT	PEKCENI	PERGENI			
			.0	.0	•0			
6	•0	•0	•0	•0	•0	42.6	42.6	
<u> </u>						9.5	9-5-	
10	3.1	.0	•0	.0	• 0	21.4	24.5	
<del>- 12</del>	4.2	•0	.0	.0	-0-	19.1	23.3	
14	1.6	• 0	•0	• 0	• 0	12.5	14.1	
16	.0	.0	.0	.0	•0	10.7	10.7	
18	• 9	• 0	•0	• 0	•0	4.7	5.6	
20	1.5	.0	-0-			3.8	<del>5-3</del>	
22	• 0	• 0	•0	• 0	•0	1.9	1.9	
	.0	-0	.0			2.1	<del>2.1</del>	
26	• 5	• 0	0	• 0	•0	•0	.5	
28	• 0	.0	•0	.0	• 0	• 0	•0	
30	• 0	• 0	•0	• 0	• 0	• 3	- 3	
32	•0	.0	.0	.0		• 0	• 0	
TOTAL	11.8	.0	.0	. 0	• 0	128.6	140.4	
PERCENT	8.4	.0	•0	• 0	.0	91.6	100.0	
DBH(QMD)	14.4	• 0	•0	• 0	•0	11.7	12.0	
NU.SAMPLE	12	12	12	12	15	12	12	`\
CVX.	195.9	• 0	.0	• 0	• 0	60.8	57.8	` ·
SETHEANT	6.563	•000	-000		-000	22-569	23.419	
SE%	56.6	• 0	.0	• 0	• 0	17.6	16.7	

Appendix D Kline Spring

+++ STAND	TABLE	NF	BASAL	AREAS	PFR	ACRE	***
-----------	-------	----	-------	-------	-----	------	-----

LAMETER DE	JUGLAS FIR	<del>-Grand</del> Fir	<del>- VESTERN-</del> Larch	ENGLEMAN— Spruce	PONEROSA PINE	-LONGPOL <del>E</del> - PINE	CLASSES		
					<del></del>		.2000.0000		
		.0	.0		•0				
	2.0	12.0	•0	•0	• 0	4.0	18.0	•	
6	<del></del>						14.0		
10	6.n	10.0	•0	• 0	6.0	16.0	38.0		
12	<del>2.0-</del>	16.0				22-0-	42.0		
14	2.0	4.0	• 0	• 0	2.0	22.0	30.0		
16	<del>-2.0</del>	4.0		.0		6.0	12.0		
18	. 0	2.0	2.0	• 0	• 0	2.0	6.0		
<del>-20</del>		<del>2-</del> n-	<del></del>	<del></del> n			2.0		
22	2.0	• 0	•0	• 0	• 0	•0	2.0		
- <del>24</del>									
26	.0	.0	•0	• 0	• 0	•0	•0		
-28-		2.0	-0-	.0	• 0		2.0		
30	.0	.0	•0	• 0	• 0	•0	.0		
-32	2.0			• •			2.0		
34	• 0	• 0	• 0	• 0	• 0	•0 •n			
36	•0	2.0	<u> </u>			•0	2.0		
38	• 0	• 0	•0	• 0	2.0				
40	.0	•0		.0	-0	•0	•0		
42	• 0	• 0	•0	• 0					
44	6.0	0				•0	•0		
46	•0	• 0	•0	• 0	.0		• ''		
TAL	26.0	58.0	4.0	-0	12.0	78.0	178.0		
ERCENT	14.6	32.6	2.2	• 0	6.7	43.8	100.0		
HI OND)	29.3	14.0	15.3	.0	18-3	1.2.3	15.9		,
D.SAMPLES	10	10	10	10	10	10	10 27 <del>-2</del>		
v7.	-120-9-	80.4	210:8		86.1	66.7	15.333		
ETHEAN	9.911	14.742	2.667	.000	3.266	16.452			
E %	39.1	25.4	66.7		27.2	21.1	U • U		

	-				1 10/15/89	•	IGE 3	
STAND TAB	LE NO. 2							
K9-28M I	MPACT PLU	15 19	RI-1985					
KLINE PL	<u> </u>							•
NCINC FE	•							_
		5.4.4						•
		*** STAND	TABLE OF T	REES PER AC	RE ***			
******			********		******	*******		
CLASS	FIR	GRAND FIR	WESTERN LARCH	ENGLEMAN	PONEROSA	LUNGPULE	TOTAL ALL	<del></del>
			L PRUI	SPRUCE	PINE	PINE	CLASSES	
6	10.2	61.1	•0	•0	•0	30.4	•0	
8	5.7	11.5	<u>-</u> 0	•0		20.4	91.7	
10	11.0	18.3	•0	• 0	11.0	29.2	69.5	
12 14	2.5	20.4	2.6	• 0	•0	28.0	53.5	
16	1.9	3.7 2.9	•0	•0	1.9	20.6	28.1	
18	• 0	1.1	1.1	• 0	•0	1.1	8.6 3.3	
20	• 0	• 9	•0	<u>.</u> ŏ			<del></del>	
22	. 8	. • 0	• 0	• 0	• 0	•0	.8	
<del>24</del> 26	•0	•0	•0	.0	-0	.0	• 0	
28	•0	• 5	•0	•0	•0	•0	•0	
30	• 0	•0	.0	. 0	• 0	•0	• 5	
32	• •	•0	•0	•0	•0	•0		
34	•0	• n	.0	.0	• 0	• 0	• 0	
38	•0	• 0	• 0	•0	• 0	-0-	• 3	
40	•0	•0	·ŏ	• • • •	• 0	•0	• 3	
42	•0	• 0	•0	• 0	. 0	•0	•0	
46	• 6	•0	•0	•0	•0	•0	•6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
70	•0	• 0	•0	.0	• 0	0	•0 :	
TUTAL	7,							
PERCENT	34.5 11.6	120.7 40.4	1.2	•0	18.9	120.8	298.6	
DBHCOMDI	11.9	9.4	14.1		6.3 11.0	40.5 10.9	100.0	
NO.SAMPLES	10	10	10	10	10	10.9	10.5	
SE (MEAN)	132.7	65.8	729.5	.0	113.4	99.1	45.1	
2E%	42.0	25.095 20.8	72.669	•000	6.764 35.9	37.906 31.3	42.608	

\*\*\* STAND TABLE OF TREES PER ACRE \*\*\*

		TOTAL ALL CLASSES	OTHERS	FDUR+ PERCENT	THREE PERCENT	TWO PERCENT	ONE PERCENT	GREEN TOP	DIAMETER CLASS
•									
		•0	•0	• 0	•0	•0	• 17	• 0	*
		91.4	30.6	• ()	• 0	•0	20.3	40.5	6
		40.1	28.6	• 0	• 0	<u> </u>	• 0	11.5	8
		69.7	51.3	• 0	• 0	•0	3.7	14.7	10
		53.5	33.1	• 0	• 0	•0	•0	27.4	15
		28.1	24.3	• 0	• 0	• 9	1.9	1.9	14
		8.6	5.7	•0	• 0	•0	• 0	2.9	16
		3.4	2.3	• 0	.0	•0	1.1	•0	18
		.,9	-0	.0	.0	•0	•0	•0	27
		. 8	. A	.0	•0 •0	•0	•0	•0	24
		.0		•0	•0	•0	•0	•0	26
		•0	•0 •0	• 0		•0		• 0	28
		•0	•0	•0	•0	•0	.0	. ó	30
		• • •		<del></del> -		<u>•</u> ŏ	<del>.</del> ő-	ŏ-	<del>32</del>
		•0	•0	• 0	•0	•0	.0	• 0	34
		3		ŏ-				<del></del> 3	36
		• 3	•3	.0	.0	•0	• 0	• 0	38
			•0	• • • •		•0	• 0	<del> </del>	40
		.0	•0	• 0	• 0	• 0	• 0	.0	42
	<del></del>			•0		-0	•0	.0	44
		• 0	•0	.0	•0	.0	•0	• 0	46
		298.6	178.0	•0	.0		27.0	93.6	TUTAL
`	•	100.0	59.6	.0	. 0	ň	9.0	31.3	PERCENT
	<del></del>	10.5	11.2		.0		8.2	9.7	DBHCOMDI
		10	10	10	10	10	10		NU.SAMPLES
		45.1	58.0			<del></del>	164.9	78.4	CV%
		42.608	32.628	.000	.000	.000	14.098	23.230	SE (MFAN)
		14.3	18.3	•0	<u>.</u>	<del></del>	57.1	24.8	SE%

STAND TABLE NO. 2

R6-SBW IMPACT PLUTS 1981-1985

KLINE PLUT \*\*\* PERCENT BARE TOP DOUGLAS-FIR \*\*\*

DIAMETER CLASS	GREEN TOP	ONE PERCENT	TWO PERCENT	THREE PERCENT	FDUR* PERCENT	OTHERS	TOTAL ALL CLASSES	
								•
6	10.2	•0	•0	•0	• ()	•0	•0	
77		•0	.0	.0	.0	81.3	91.5	The second second
10	7.3	5.7	•0	.0		34.4	40.1	
	7.3	3.7	.0	• 0	• 0	58.7	69.7	5r
12	2.5	• 0	•0	• 0	• 0	50.9	53.4	
14	1.9	• 0	•0	• 0	• 0	26.2	28.1	
16	1.4	• 13	•0	•0	• 0	7.2	8.6	
18	• 0	•0	•0	• 0	• 0	3.4	3.4	
20	<u> . û</u>	• • •	• • •	.0	• 0	.9	.9	
55	• 8	• 0	•0	• 0	• 0	•0	<b>.</b> 8	
24	• 0	.0	•0	•0	.0	•0	•0	
26	• 0	.0	•0	• 0	• 0	• 0	• 0	
28	•0	• 0	•0	• 0	• 11	• 5	• 5	
30	• 0	• 0	• 0	• 0	• 0	• 0	• 0	
35	. 4	•0	• 0	•0	.0	•0	. 4	
34	• 0	• 0	• 0	• 0	• n	• 0	• 0	
36	• 0	• 11	•0-	• 0	•0-	• 3	• 3	
38	• 0	• 0	•0	• 0	• 0	• 3	• 3	•
40	• 0	• 0	•0	• 0	• 0	•0	• 0	
42	• 0	• 0	•0	• 0	• 0	• 0	.0	<i>)</i>
44	• 5	•0	•0	• 0	.0	.0	•6	
46	• 0	•0	•0	.0	•0	-0-	•0	
TUTAL	25.1	9.4		.0	.0	264.1	798.6	
PERCENT	R. 4	3.1	.0	.0	. 0	88.4	100.0	
DBH (OHD)	17.9	8.8	ŏ-			10:3	10:5	
NO.SAMPLES	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	
CAY	187.1	717.1				54.6	45.1	
SE (MFAN)	14.921	6.450	.000	•000	.000	45.638	42.608	